

Measurement and Its Mathematical Scale

Zhen Wang

Physics Department, LiaoNing Normal University, DaLian 116029, P. R. China

February 1, 2008

Abstract

It is argued that every measurement is made in a certain scale. The scale in which present measurements are made is called present scale which gives present knowledge. Quantities at the limits to present measurement may be observables in other scales. Cantor's series of infinities is used to describe scales of measurement. Continuum Hypothesis and Schroedinger Cat are discussed.

Measurement in quantum mechanics has been at the core of debate since quantum mechanics was first born, because this problem is concerned with a profound philosophical question: the relation between the outside world and the observer. One of the many well-known paradoxes in quantum mechanics is the Schroedinger Cat[1]. The question arises from this ideal experiment is : does quantum mechanics describes true states in reality? In this paper we are going to discuss the problem from the mathematical aspect of measurement. We shall show that classification of states must corresponds to measurement in a certain scale.

We know for any observable we have certain limit in its measurement. Ideal measurement, which is infinitely accurate, is impossible in reality, just like the case that a physical world could not exist without friction. Thus mathematically there must be a smallest unit for any measurement. This smallest unit represents the limit in the measurement, therefore it can not be identified. Its nature is unknown to the observer. For these reasons, we give it the name, uncertainty quantum, and denoted as q . The interesting point here is: although the uncertainty quantum composes a quantity, it can not be figured out from the quantity itself. Otherwise it could not represent the limit in the measurement. For examples, distance is composed of space quantum, q_l . This can be concluded from Zeno paradox[2]. Though time is not an observable in physics, it is also in quantum. This can be shown with a thought experiment[3].

Suppose we have an ideal, infinitely-high-rate model camera, with which we can take infinite films in any short time interval. Of course we also have a model projector which can show infinite number of films. Then let's aim at a running dog. If time were not quantized, we would be able to take infinite films of the

running dog in any time interval. If then we show these infinite number of films at the normal rate in cinema, the picture on the screen would be motionless. Of course we can see a running dog if we show the films at the same rate as we take them. But because of our persistence of vision (*which may be a little bit different from person to person*), we lose infinite information of the reality. We can not know what happens within the interval of persistence of vision. That shows motion is the direct result of our persistence of vision, which is the uncertainty quantum of time for us human observer in this case. Thus time, and any quantity, would be meaningless if it were not in quantum, the definite ignorance which composes the observable.

So a quantity may be expressed as

$$F = \sum q_F \quad (1)$$

where q_F is the uncertainty quantum for F . For any quantity to be measurable, the uncertainty quantum must fulfill the infinitesimal condition[4]:

$$F \pm q_F = F \quad (2)$$

which may account for the genesis of continuity. That is to say, an observable and its uncertainty quantum can not be identified at the same time. Actually, the uncertainty quantum can not be identified *by definition*, just like infinite. For the same reason, a certain infinite ∞_F is defined. Thus we can express (1) as

$$F = q_F \cdot \infty_F \quad (3)$$

In suitable unit, we can get the relation between uncertainty quantum and the infinite:

$$q = \frac{1}{\infty} \quad (4)$$

It is evident that there is no absolute infinite and infinitesimal. All infinite and infinitesimal are referred to some specific measurement. So the uncertainty quantum and the infinite has defined a certain *scale*, in which we do our measurement. If we adopt an opinion which is opposite to the Anthropic Principle[5], i.e., we suppose no scale is special, then it is quite straightforward to come to the point that all the infinities and infinitesimals should be measurable in other scales, and symmetrically, all observables can be infinitesimals or infinities in other scales.

Therefore it is necessary to make clear the scope of scale. Apparently this means to study the structure beyond the infinite ∞ , or within the uncertainty quantum q . Thus our study is connected naturally with Cantor's study of transcendental infinities. We know simple counting gives only one infinite cardinal. That is, in the following series, there is only one infinite cardinal $\aleph_0$:

$$1, 2, \dots, \omega, \omega + 1, \dots, 2\omega, \dots, \omega^2, \dots, \omega^\omega, \dots \quad (5)$$

where ω is first infinite, the enumerable infinite. So just like simple counting produces no new cardinals, new scales can not be defined by extending present scale with any well-defined mathematical operation. We simply take uncertainty quantum and infinite as the joining point of two adjacent scales. This can be best expressed as:

$$\cdots, \aleph_{-\alpha}, \cdots, \aleph_{-2}, \aleph_{-1}, \cdots, 1, 2, \cdots, \aleph_0, \aleph_1, \cdots, \aleph_\alpha, \cdots \quad (6)$$

in which $\aleph_{-1}$ is the uncertainty quantum for $1, 2, \cdots$, $\aleph_{-2}$ is the uncertainty quantum for $\aleph_{-1}$, and so on. It is obvious that observables in present scale $1, 2, \cdots$, are uncertainty quantum relative to quantities $\aleph_0$ in the next bigger scale. This can be easily verified:

$$\aleph_0 \pm n = \aleph_0, \quad n \leq \aleph_0 \quad (7)$$

Thus $\{\aleph_{-1}, \aleph_0\}$ defines the *present scale* for present measurements, in which $\aleph_{-1}$ is the uncertainty quantum, $\aleph_0$ is the infinite limit. Apparently the present scale represents our knowledge, while other scales represent our ignorance. We show in other work[3] that the uncertainty quantum contains all information in the present scales. In fact all scales in the complement of the present scale are connected, i.e., all our ignorance is connected.

Such classification of scales is necessary in dealing with problems involving infinite quantities, because some infinite quantities may be in different scales. If a problem is not in present scale, it has to be transformed into the present scale, since we only have theories for problems in present scale. The Continuum Hypothesis (CH) is an example[6]. In 1878 Cantor presumed that the weight of the real set is the second cardinal, which was later expressed as

$$2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 \quad (8)$$

Apparently the quantities in this problem are not in the present scale. To solve the problem, we have either to establish theory dealing with problem in other scale, or to transformed the problem into the present scale, i.e. to change to the next bigger scale. The latter seems easier since the arithmetics in this problem is very simple: it involves only multiplication. From

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 n_2 \aleph_0 &= n_1 + n_2 + \aleph_0 = \aleph_0, \quad n_1, n_2 \leq \aleph_0 \\ \aleph_\alpha + \aleph_\beta &= \aleph_\alpha \cdot \aleph_\beta = \max(\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_\beta) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

we can see that : *Multiplication would change to summation when it gets into next bigger scale from present scale.* With this preposition we can have new insight to CH problem.

If transformed to the next bigger scale, the CH would change to

$$2 + 2 + \cdots = \aleph_0 \quad (10)$$

This is apparently true. One question may be raised: does the problem still preserve its original significance after such transformation? We try to look at the problem from a perspective outside mathematics. CH deals with an unenumerable world and calls for new theory. Of course we live in an enumerable world, in which we can count or enumerate (which is also a form of measurement). Therefore the new theory required should bridge the enumerable and the unenumerable world. In other words, CH is unprovable in nature because it deals with something in the world of limitation to our present knowledge. We can *NOT* prove it while preserving present knowledge, since the world of limitation is exactly produced by present knowledge. That is the significance of CH.

Thus our knowledge is expressed with well-defined states, which are philosophically discontinuous so as to produce difference. But the difference is composed of uncertainty quanta which can not be known in that knowledge. That is to say, knowledge and ignorance are produced at the same time. Actually, this is also true in the case of the Schroedinger Cat. In defining the state "dead" and "alive", we produce the limitation about the state "dead" and "alive". For an outside observer, "unknown" is usual state in reality, just like the states "dead" and "alive". Here the "dead", "alive" and "unknown" are defined with the state of a radio-active atom, rather than medical means. This is consistent with quantum mechanics as well as daily experience. For an inside observer, it seems that he has better and more natural means to define "dead" and "alive": his ability to think. But such an idea of "measurement" is questionable: could one find that he could not think? In fact, one can not define a "dead" state for oneself. For him the states "dead" and "unknown" get mixed, so that the definition of the state "alive" becomes questionable. Thus the "unknown" state is different for the inside and outside observers.

When ignorance is different, knowledge must be different. After all, quantum mechanics tells only probability, though it is mathematically complete. The uncertainty connects profoundly with our classification of states. In a sense, we may even say our measurement decides the result of the measurement to some extent. Not only in quantum mechanics, this may also be true in classical realm[7]. From the above discussion on mathematical scale, we can see that counting as a measurement inevitably introduces uncertainty into mathematics. If mathematics is doomed to have uncertainty, probability may be all we can ask from physics.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Bernard d'Espagnat, *Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Benjamin 1971)
- [2] Rozsa Peter, *Playing with Infinity* (Bell 1961)
- [3] Zhen Wang, quant-ph/9806071
- [4] Zhen Wang, quant-ph/9807035
- [5] H. Pagels, *The Sciences*, Vol. 25, no.2, 1985
- [6] P. J. Cohen, *Set Theory and Continuum Hypothesis* (W. A. Benjamin

Inc., New York 1966)

[7]Zhen Wang, quant-ph/9804070